

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING
January 12, 2005
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
U-221 Proposed Plan	1
Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)	4
Central Plateau Planning.....	5
K Basins Proposed Plan for the Record of Decision Amendment (ROD)	7
Barriers / Capping Workshop	8
Decision documents check-in and look ahead	12
Committee Business.....	12
Handouts	13
Attendees.....	14

<i>This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.</i>

Welcome and Introductions

Maynard Plahuta, committee vice-chair, provided committee welcome and introductions. Comments on the December meeting summary were added, and the December meeting summary was adopted.

U-221 Proposed Plan

Dick Smith and Rob Davis presented their technical review of the U-221 Proposed Plan. Dick and Rob developed a paper (refer to handout) providing their view and analysis of the plan, based on an objective comparison and ranking of the four alternatives using the nine Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) evaluation criteria. Their review suggests that only Alternative 1 (the total dismantlement and removal option) really satisfies the Hanford Advisory Board's guiding principle, 'Retrieve, Treat, and Dispose,' for hazardous and radioactive waste. All four alternatives satisfy four of the nine CERCLA criteria, protection of human health and the environment, and compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs). Therefore, the remaining five balancing CERCLA criteria were used to evaluate and rank the alternatives.

Based on their evaluation and ranking, the removal option ranked the highest, and is therefore preferred. The partial dismantlement option ranked second highest, and the intact in-situ options ranked last and are not preferred.

In addition to the technical review of the U-221 Proposed Plan, Shelley Cimon and Susan Leckband provided the committee with their policy review of the proposed plan. Their review drew from the paper, "Framing of Issues Disposition of Canyon Facilities Prepared by EnviroIssues For Hanford Advisory Board," developed in 1997, to break down the technical review into a series of values and principles, in addition to a list of what advice has already been issued (refer to handout). Several questions were also posed, which Shelley and Susan believe need to be answered by the Department of Energy (DOE) before bringing the issue to the HAB.

From their overarching question, 'Do we have an overall picture of what's going to happen, and a sense that there is an integrative approach to future activities?', they came to a "middle of the road" recommendation that complete removal is not cost-effective and the technical analysis done by Dick and Rob provides useful information for developing middle-ground possibilities.

Committee Discussion

- Dick was asked to provide his personal opinion on the alternatives in the U-221 Proposed Plan. Since removal was the preferred alternative, he responded that timing is the key issue, since it all depends on whether waste is removed now versus in 70 to 80 years. However, since there is a lot of dose exposure involved in the process of removing waste and transporting it, there are still significant issues concerning dose rate in the removal alternative. Rob added that the goal is to try and limit exposing workers to the same dose and waste source, to reduce the cumulative effect that adds to a higher worker dose. Also, in his estimation, the costs for monitoring, loading and filling canyons with grout were underestimated in the plan.
- *Maynard asked if the numbers used in the paper produced by Dick and Rob were from the proposed plan?* Dick said the numbers from the plan were used and were assembled for each alternative. He added that he felt the focused Feasibility study supporting the proposed plan was thorough and the methodology was good, but one critique of the plan was that it did not present any detailed information on doses in particular cells.
- *Pam Larsen asked why Dick and Rob provided a bias for removal, but remain significantly concerned about dose exposure?* Dick and Rob responded that it only makes sense to grout an area that will remain in place for eternity, but not grout an area that is planned for future removal.
- *Shelley asked where all the over-burden for caps and barriers would come from?* She commented that by her calculations, the material needed for all the caps currently under consideration for the Central Plateau would fill either: 1) a space with dimensions of 100 yards by 30 yards, three quarters of a mile deep, and 2) a space the size of a football field, seven and a half miles deep, or the area of the entire Tri Cities, six inches deep.
- *Tom Stoops asked whether Dick's recommendation would include that the proposed plan be revised with more creative options considered and evaluated?* Dick said that

more creative options should be considered by the plan, otherwise of the existing alternatives, Alternative 1 (the total dismantlement and removal option) should be chosen.

- Vince Panesko suggested that he would like to see this discussion in the broader context of the 200 Area.
- As part of the policy review of the proposed plan, Susan summarized the list of regulatory issues, institutional control issues, integration of cleanup effort, and technical issues for committee discussion (refer to handout).
 - *Concern that the Department of Energy, Richland Operations (DOE-RL) project managers do not have decision-making authority, which results in delays in work and activity.* Maynard stated that there is a need to identify some specific examples to illustrate this concern and make the call for advice more striking.
 - *Concern for integrated and cooperative role of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). Need an implementation process for addressing authority and timing of cleanup efforts.* Craig Cameron, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), stated that EPA and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) have worked well together, but many integration issues are relevant for planning and over-arching things involving the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI). Joe Voice, DOE-RL, explained that a process for addressing authority and timing issues already exists explicitly in the Tri-Party Agreement.
 - *Can canyons be backfilled with ‘rubblized’ waste from on and/or off-site prior to grouting to fill void spaces (To avoid the need for amount of backfill material)?*
 - *The committee asked the agencies whether there is an intra-state waste disposal plan? Is there a real integration between contractors /agencies regarding onsite waste disposal?* Joe suggested that there is a foundation for intra-state type activities, and that integration is occurring.
- *Maynard asked the committee what the risk assessments of the options are? He suggested that this is the main, overarching issue, since any option can be discussed a lot, but what is the bottom line risk assessment?* Pam agreed, stating that it is especially true for communicating options and activities to the public and getting the information out. Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that he was not sure that Maynard’s question could be answered, since risk assessments are more of an art than a science, providing a relative range of risk instead of an absolute assessment of risk and are therefore difficult to quantify. Craig echoed Dennis’s comments, stating that one can do the best risk assessment based on the best available assumptions, but questions concerning the accuracy of those assumptions or whether institutional controls are working, might impact the certainty of a risk assessment.
- Todd Martin attempted to clarify the discussion, suggesting that the committee needs to decide whether U-221 is a priority. If so, then we should ask, “What should be

done?” In an attempt to develop some principles for possible advice from the committee, Todd summarized the information from the technical and policy analyses: Consider whether U-221 is a priority and should be funded OR choose Alternative 1, 1a, or 1b, recognizing that Alternative 6 may not be consistent with Hanford Advisory Board (Board) bias for ‘retrieve, treat, and dispose’ AND there is no compelling rationale presented for Alternative 6 being the right alternative in the holistic context of the Central Plateau. Based on his analysis, Dick agreed that Todd’s summary was an appropriate distillation of the issue.

- Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, stated that he believes reevaluating the whole plan seems to go against principle three from the policy analysis (“Get on with it”), and voiced his concern that stepping back from the existing alternatives and/or choosing a different preferred alternative would risk delaying the process. Dick reminded the committee that a work plan for this work has not been issued; looking at some other options to see if they make more sense is still a viable option. If the decision is made to tear the plant down, then ideas about a more cost effective and efficient way to proceed should be examined. Kevin stated that he believes that there is likely some room for compromise, where some of Dick and Robs’ ideas can be incorporated. Craig suggested that recommendations in record of decision documents (RODs) can be considered without having to do a complete reevaluation. Pam reminded the committee that it will become more difficult to achieve adequate funding, so it is important to proceed quickly since other sites are looking to Hanford as a model for how to approach dealing with waste.
- Dennis suggested that the Board’s comment that Alternative 6 (preferred alternative) may not be the most appropriate alternative means that EPA, DOE, and the Ecology did not initially present the alternative adequately.
- Craig stated that he believes a new environmental impact statement (EIS) may not need to be conducted prior to implementing U Plant cleanup. However, Pam noted that some feel that an EIS does need to be done if it is to serve as a model for other canyon cleanups. She asked for volunteers to draft advice. Susan Leckband volunteered to help draft advice. Todd suggested wording advice so that the Board recommends DOE consider Alternatives 1, 1a, and 1b, and attach Dick and Robs’ technical analysis paper to the advice for background. He stated that he does not believe the Board will come to consensus on one alternative.
- Maynard indicated that although the Board has a bias towards ‘retrieve, treat, and dispose,’ that action may not be appropriate in this instance based on cost effectiveness and what is most protective.
- Committee members should send comments and ideas on the issue to Susan for drafting advice. A draft will need to be completed in the next couple of days.

Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)

Based on previous discussion of IDF at the December River and Plateau Committee (RAP) meeting, there were several questions the committee still needed answered. Pam summarized discussion from the December meeting: The committee discussed the question of whether there is a possibility that construction of the first 130,000m³ would move ahead? Pam reminded the committee that Ecology has an issue with the Hanford Solid Waste EIS (HSW-EIS) not adequately looking at cumulative impacts. The Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) and CH2M Hill has contracted with a company to start work. Unless DOE-ORP is able to obtain the work permit they will have to “cash-out” the contract.

Committee Discussion

- Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP, informed the committee that there are allowances built into the contract to allow the contract to be suspended without losing the contract. If the work delay extends too long, the risk is that it will go outside the extent of the contract. Jane Hedges, Ecology, indicated that they are interested in looking for a path forward that will answer the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements, but that things are on hold for now.
- *Pam stated that she finds the on-hold status troubling, and asked if there is something that the Board can do to help move things along so that the project can proceed?* Jane explained that SEPA analysis does not allow for activity, and that SEPA analysis is moving ahead as quickly as possible.
- Pam suggested that these questions be directed to the appropriate individuals at the joint RAP and Tank Waste Committee meeting the following day. Joe expressed caution on how much DOE can discuss the issue since there are still legal actions concerning the EIS. *Dennis stated the need to ask what Ecology and DOE are doing to break the impasse on permitting IDF?*

Central Plateau Planning

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, provided the committee with an overview of the “Plan for Central Plateau Closure.” The document reflects remediation planning that was framed by previous official decisions and agreements, such as the Tri Party Agreement (TPA), Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 7 Point Risk Framework, and the CERCLA Regulatory Process. He stressed that the Plan is not a decision document, and should instead be viewed as a planning tool that provides a comprehensive look at what needs to be done on the Central Plateau. The Plan provides a guide that outlines the required scope elements to be addressed in order to complete the cleanup of the Central Plateau.

Margo Voogd, DOE-RL, provided the committee with an overview of the contents of the plan, focusing especially on Zone Closure Packages appearing in the Appendices. These sections in the appendix provide summary tables for each Zone, including the following headings: Background; Closure Elements; Support to Hanford Site Cleanup; Risks to Workers, the Public, and the Environment; Closure Approach; Closure State; Interfaces

and Constraints; Priority and Schedule; and Programmatic Risks. In addition, these sections include maps and a milestones timeline for each zone that includes constraints.

Regulator Perspectives

- John Price, Ecology, said that Ecology was not directly involved in the process of developing the Plan, and since it is not a regulatory document, his comments are limited. He suggested that the document needed some work in developing and using better cost models. John stated that he believes it will be a very useful document that can help the Board in two main areas: 1) In providing advice on the appropriateness of what DOE is proposing for contracting, and 2) Drafting advice on TPA milestones.
- Dennis Faulk indicated that EPA has not had a substantive discussion with DOE on principles for the cleanup process, and that the Plan might provide the context for having that discussion. He suggested the document could help EPA in geographic consideration for discussion of potential activities. In addition to stating how the Plan is useful for EPA, Dennis also provided some concerns about the plan: Plans often become larger than themselves, and since this plan is conceptual there are concerns that as some decisions are made, the plan will end up functioning more like a decision document.
- When reviewing the plan, both Dennis and Joe cautioned the committee to keep in mind that the assumptions made in the plan have not been committed to. They reiterated that the plan is not a decision document.

Committee Discussion

- *Maynard asked what kind of buy-in DOE has on the document?* Larry indicated that it is a contractor deliverable, so DOE has provided comments, but the plan is only being used as a planning tool that informs three major DOE decision-making processes.
- *Susan asked what DOE's expectations are for the Board regarding the Plan for Central Plateau Closure document?* Larry reminded the committee that the plan represents a point of view, and pointed out that there will be some disconnects between the plan document and DOE's operating baseline. He suggested that the committee use the plan as a tool for discussion of cleaning up the Central Plateau. Larry confirmed that there is a method for letting the committee know if something in the document were to change so that they are not operating with outdated language. Pam recommended that there was no need for specific advice to be developed, but that a similar presentation of the plan document would be appropriate for the HAB.
- *Susan said that Larry referred to using the document as some kind of basis for contracts, and asked if there is a timeline for that?* Larry said that no timeline is available, and that two-thirds of environmental management work is being contracted in the next 18 months. Committee members indicated their hope that contracts adhere to TPA requirements.

- Harold Heacock commented that if committee members take the time to examine the plan document, there would surely be questions about the content. He suggested having the committee develop question areas, which should be examined in a later meeting.

K Basins Proposed Plan for the Record of Decision Amendment (ROD)

Paul Pak and Dave Faulkner, DOE-RL, provided an update on the proposed plan for the ROD amendment. They explained what was committed in the original 1999 ROD, and what DOE is proposing to amend. There are four major work scopes committed to in the 1999 ROD: 1) Spent fuel remediation – which is complete; 2) Water – work scope will not be changed; 3) Sludge remediation – The 1999 ROD required removing sludge and holding untreated sludge until enough information and technology exists to treat. The ROD amendment would allow sludge to be treated, since there is now enough information and technology to treat at this time; 4) Debris – Significant quantities exist (not sure how much debris is in basins). The 1999 ROD requires taking care of all debris in the basin. If debris is removed, workers will be exposed to hours of waste removal. The ROD amendment would allow leaving and grouting basins with some material, but make those materials increasingly stable, which limits worker exposure and makes waste more environmentally benign. Changes in debris management will streamline waste treatment. These amendments are not a departure from the 1999 ROD, but reflect an effort to accelerate cleanup efforts.

Paul provided the committee with information regarding the K Basin cleanup plan. Cracks were discovered in the basin by cameras during the removal of sludge. Although removal work was not stopped because of the crack, DOE is taking the cracks very seriously and taking action to monitor for them. Performance indicators monitoring inside and outside the basins have demonstrated no change in basin water level has occurred, no physical water loss has occurred, there have been no spikes in contamination of nearby groundwater wells, and the cracks appear old and previously repaired. Monitoring is taking place on a daily basis, and further action is being taken, including an engineering evaluation, a higher review of monitoring well data, and daily monitoring of water levels. In case of any detected abnormality, corrective actions will be taken immediately.

Regulator Perspectives

- Larry Gadbois, EPA, explained that sludge material needs to be dry in order to dispose of it. Furthermore, some sludge is still chemically reactive, so treatment will have to take care of that as well. He also stated that dose requirements need to be met, and that liquid sludge needs to be turned into dry sludge, such as grouted, and undergo a complete fuel removal. The void spaces in the basins need to be filled, and liquid wastes removed for disposal of at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).

Committee Discussion

- *Pam asked if DOE has determined how it will deal with sludge?* Paul responded that specifics will be available after the amended ROD is issued.
- *When will the amended ROD likely be issued?* Paul said that the ROD proposed plan would likely be available for public comment between January 19 and February 22, and it will appear on the Hanford Public Involvement website (www.hanford.gov/calendar). The committee agreed there was no need to have a presentation of the amendment information for the HAB. Todd noted that the amendment is consistent with previous HAB advice.
- *Pam indicated that more solid material is being found in sludge waste than expected. She asked how the proposed ROD assessment would affect handling debris?* Larry explained that the existing plan for removing solid waste material was to remove it item by item, which is a lot of work and effort. The proposed change would be to leave much of the debris in the basins, encase it in a grout pour, and remove the debris as part of removing the basin structure.
- *A committee member asked why, if all the contaminated material is being removed from the basins for disposal at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) and the basins are then being removed and disposed of at ERDF, not just cut up basins and dispose of all the contaminated material and the basins at ERDF?* Tom Stoops explained that there would be concerns about cutting up the basins for disposal to ERDF.
- Larry stated that there are no cleanup requirements in the ROD, and that cleanup of the basins must be completed to achieve the other goals for cleanup in the K Basin area.
- Pam noted that this new approach to sludge treatment and cleanup is an improvement over the previous plan to put untreated sludge as a liquid for storage in barrels.
- *Shelley asked how the ROD amendment impacts the work scope and the number of workers?* Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, said that contracts have already been amended to reflect the change in work scope, and that those changes have reduced the number of workers. Many of the K Basin workers have transferred to the Plutonium Finishing Plant cleanup.
- *Based on Paul's overview of the K Basin storage plan and the recent issue with the discovered crack, Vince Panesko, asked for confirmation that contamination would have to travel 50 feet to be detected by monitoring wells.* Paul confirmed that if there is leakage, contamination would have to travel 50 feet to be detected, and that there are three wells that would detect contamination.

Barriers / Capping Workshop

Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, provided the committee with an overview and technical presentation of surface barriers for waste containment. Rob Davis passed out a series of "Big Picture Questions on Caps / Barriers" (refer to handout) that he developed with

input from others Board members on caps and barriers. Kevin reminded the committee of the caps and barriers technical workshop planned for March 1-2. The first day will be training, and the second day will be a question and answer session and field trip to natural analogue sites.

In his presentation, Kevin discussed the current status of barriers, barrier design criteria, long-term performance, and how the Board can help. Kevin discussed the history of barriers, highlighting barrier objectives, current evapotranspiration (ET) barrier types used (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act subtitle D and subtitle C), and problems with these barriers. Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Actions (UMTRA) required new barrier for radioactive waste, which prompted evaluation of natural analogs to provide insight into how to design new barrier prototypes. All barriers being discussed are ET barriers as opposed to just using concrete slab barriers (which have no natural analogues).

The “Hanford Prototype Barrier” is the only engineered barrier employed at Hanford. Several years of site-specific data from the Hanford Prototype Barrier and Field Lysimeter will be utilized for the conceptual design, permitting, and final design of Hanford waste-site barriers. There is no site-wide policy on barriers, but the general ET barrier will likely be the barrier of choice for the Central Plateau. As part of the remedial alternative selection process, the CERCLA decision process addresses the costs and benefits of these barriers. In addition, there are many other criteria used in the selection process, including modeling, remedial action objectives, regulator input/compliance, and stakeholder input. The Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC) alternative cover design process will also be incorporated. Kevin also explained how the Board could help in the process of promoting the idea of barriers.

- Attend Barrier Workshop/Field Trip, March 1 & 2
- Openly voice questions and concerns
- Understand issues and challenges
- Tour sites, test facilities and natural analogues
- Review and comment on various proposed plans

Regulator Perspectives

- Craig Cameron, EPA, commented that ET caps and other associated barrier technologies are increasingly useful and appropriate for waste disposal.
- Rick Bond, Ecology, said that in general, Ecology supports the Board’s ‘retrieve, treat, and dispose’ mantra, but regarding caps Ecology supports the use of the ET caps. He emphasized the need to keep bigger picture disposal risks in mind when thinking about specific risks of various sites. If removal and treatment is conducted in some areas, keep in mind that we should think about using removed material as backfill for sites that are being capped (e.g. 300 area rubble). Additionally, he suggested using clean rubble as part of caps for some areas.

Committee Discussion

- *Susan asked if there are any barriers for unstable sites?* Kevin responded that single layer barriers are typically used for unstable sites.
- *Referring to the discussion of a standard Hanford barrier, Rob asked why a standard Hanford barrier would not be developed and used throughout the Hanford site?* Kevin suggested that a basic model exists for a standard Hanford barrier, and that it will be an ET barrier, however aspects like layers and design will vary by site depending on the type of waste and environmental conditions (slope, fire, precipitation, biological intrusion, etc). Currently DOE is looking at two types of ET barriers: 1) Monofill ET Barrier, and 2) Capillary Barrier. Kevin also indicated the environmental conditions that make Hanford a good site for waste disposal, including silt-loam soils, an average of seven inches of annual precipitation, and the depth of the groundwater.
- *Shelley asked how the need for monitoring wells is weighed in the design of barriers, and how do we know we need monitoring wells?* Kevin said that there is a need for an integrative site-wide vadose zone monitoring program. The design for the U-221 Plant will be based on an evaluation of monitoring results from other regulatory approved barriers.
- The committee discussed the content and approach of the barrier workshop. *Susan asked if the workshop is only for folks that are familiar with the nomenclature associated with barriers? She suggested that a glossary or dictionary be developed for those with less familiarity with barriers.* Kevin agreed a dictionary would be useful, and said that it would be helpful to have Board members present at the workshop. Pam said that she would attend. Susan cautioned Kevin to not lose perspective of broader policy perspective for the technical information in the barrier workshop.
- *Rob stated that many Board members will be concerned about cumulative effects, and asked how, for instance, two caps near each other would interfere?* Kevin responded that with several Capillary Barriers, issues associated with interflow and water collection from seepage coming from side slopes would have to be dealt with. Monofill ET barriers do not have interflow problems. Joe Voice noted that cap spacing is a key issue.
- *Todd Martin asked whether or not there should be a site-wide policy for barriers, since one currently does not exist?* Kevin indicated the desire to maintain flexibility and said that there should be a site-wide criteria to evaluate the application and design of barriers, which will likely require going through the CERCLA process a few times to develop a check list of sorts to evaluate what needs to be done in a particular situation. He considers it an evolutionary process. *Todd asked whether a site-wide policy duplicates what CERCLA already covers?* Craig said that he thinks it could be a useful tool that would have to be combined with risk assessments that are used to determine what appropriate action should be taken. Kevin stated that he believes developing a checklist is appropriate and likely, but that evaluating each waste site is important as well. He noted that the number of sites requiring capping is hard to

estimate, so actual numbers of capped sites and the overall area will likely decrease. Dennis stated that the U-Plant and BC Cribs are sites where these specific decisions currently need to be made. Summarizing the discussion, Susan commented that 'retrieve, treat, and dispose' is the Board's first and default approach to cleanup. So, if it is determined the 'retrieve, treat, and dispose' principle is not appropriate, then capping should be the next preferred approach.

- The committee discussed how to approach bringing the topic of barriers to the Board. Pam suggested Dennis could develop some hypothetical situation involving a decision-making process dealing with the same sorts of issues as BC Cribs. Penny suggested that the information for the Board should focus on some technical information, such as describing what an ET barrier is, as well as policy information, such as illustrating where capping issues fall into the decision tree. HAB members need to understand caps and barriers in order to have a broader discussion and develop informed advice about when to use or not use caps and barriers. Tom said he also believes there is a need to provide some Board advice on the need for fill for capped sites and the amount of cap area.
- Larry commented that he believes that the issues concerning activities at Hanford are a result of perceived risk and risk acceptance, and that DOE and others need to learn to communicate the real risks of activities. *Craig asked several questions about risk acceptance: How do people feel if we go after hot spots, but do not go after areas where someone might be able to get into? Where is the threshold? What are people willing to accept in terms of intruder risk if institutional controls do not carry on?* Dennis said that the BC Cribs site might be in good enough shape to discuss, and could serve as an example for illustrating the struggle over limiting intruder risk v. dealing with hot spots. He suggested mimicking what was done at the 200 Area Workshop, so that including the topic at a Board meeting would involve an introduction of caps and barriers, discussing a scenario (e.g. BC Cribs), and then conduct several dialogue sessions. Larry Romine expressed concern about using the BC Cribs site as an example for the next meeting, preferring to wait until March when new data will have been incorporated and the example can be properly developed. Dennis responded that the discussion would not be choosing a remedy for BC Cribs, but instead would use it as a foundation for a discussion of barriers.
- Based on the concern expressed about using the BC Cribs site as an example for the HAB, the committee decided to use a hypothetical "straw" example for the next Board meeting, saving the discussion of BC Cribs for the March meeting. *Susan asked whether caps and barriers should be discussed at the next Board meeting?* Dennis suggested that the discussion should be limited to surface barriers.
- Barbara Harper commented that information on barriers should be presented to the Natural Resources Council Board of Trustees. Pam put forward a request to have a presentation given to the Board of Trustees.

Decision documents check-in and look ahead

Committee Discussion

- Pam reviewed the previous committee discussion regarding Engineering Evaluations/Cost Analyses (EE/CA), stating that before the last RAP meeting, not much attention had been paid to EE/CAs. The schedule of document release and the timeline for comment periods were provided to the committee (refer to handout).
- Pam took the committee through the schedule of EE/CAs, outlining the status of each document, noting that the ERDF ROD Amendment is on the agenda and the remainder of the EE/CAs are on the watch list. The committee is on schedule with the U-221 Facility, received a presentation on the K Basin Interim Remedial Action ROD, and Rick Jansen's drafted advice on transuranic (TRU) waste will wait until the February meeting.
- *Todd asked for committee members' advice to Board members concerning the DOE technical barrier workshop and covering travel for Board members?* The committee discussed the nature of the workshop and the utility it would have for Board members. The committee suggested travel should be approved for any Board members (within a reasonable number) who wish to attend. Several committee members expressed interest in attending the workshop.
- *Joe Voice asked the committee what they thought Board members should get out of the workshop?* Committee members suggested that the workshop is a way to provide education, build acceptance, and reduce fear concerning caps and barriers. Having Board members attend the workshop would eliminate the problem of having people argue against caps without adequately understanding what they are and how they work. For clarification, Joe told the committee that he feels like they are asking for a strong technical workshop, which needs to be communicated to Board members. Dennis added that the workshop needs to be geared for regulators as well, which representatives from Ecology agreed with.

Committee Business

- The committee requested another groundwater report for the February RAP meeting.
- Shelley informed the committee that Interagency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) meetings have been cancelled a lot. There will be a waste management meeting next Wednesday from 8-9:30 a.m. at Ecology. The Central Plateau has collapsed down into a discussion focused on Central Plateau closure.
- Dennis asked the agencies if they are comfortable with the barriers presentation for the Board? Pam noted that the barrier presentation for the committee did not involve the regulators, who expressed interest in being involved in developing the presentation. Joe explained that with the holiday schedule the way it was DOE had to go ahead with creating the presentation without regulator input. Despite efforts to contact regulators, he said that DOE and regulators were not able to connect. He added that Dennis's comments from a previous call were incorporated into the presentation. Due to the breadth and depth of committee questions for agency

presentations (i.e. the “Big Picture Questions on Caps / Barriers”), Dennis said it would be nice to have issue managers invited to participate in the formulation of future presentations in order to address some of those questions up front.

- The committee revisited the issues and assignments in the RAP Work Planning Table (refer to handout). Gary Petersen volunteered to be lead issue manager for waste management, and Dave Einan, EPA, and Rick Bond, Ecology will be the regulatory agency liaisons. Pam replaces Susan on TRU issue work planning team.
- Dennis cautioned the committee that the TRU discussion, at least in terms of specific numbers, is not ripe yet. However, if TRU discussion is a response to Gerry Pollet’s concern about pre-1970s TRU, then the committee could certainly take the issue to the Board. The committee discussed whether to include TRU discussion on the next meeting agenda. Pam commented that Hanford needs the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) to be planning to accommodate TRU. Pre-1970 TRU needs to be pursued nationally and WIPP should be expanded. Todd suggested the committee needs to consolidate what we have at the policy level and fill in the holes. Arguing about the quantity of TRU would not be a useful discussion.
- The committee discussed whether Board advice on the budget figures regarding TRU be put on the HAB meeting agenda. The committee decided that draft TRU advice would be circulated among committee members, and comments and thoughts about including it on the agenda sent to Penny.
- The next two Board meetings are: March 3-4 and April 28-29.
- The committee decided no committee call was needed, and developed the meeting agenda for the RAP meeting on February 9:
 - ERDF ROD Amendment
 - BC Cribs status of alternatives and discussion (frame for Board meeting)
 - Groundwater Protection Program update
 - * TRU discussion (frame discussion for HAB)
 - 200 Area Risk-based End States
 - The March RAP meeting should include discussion about the series of waste sites in U Area pre-closure. The document may not be available, but the committee can still begin to frame what is expected.

Handouts

- Consideration on the Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 221-U Facility (Canyon Disposition Initiative), Richard I. Smith, P.E. and Robert Davis, PhD, 1/9/2005.
- Issues: Canyon Disposition Initiative (221-U Facility), Shelley Cimon and Susan Leckband, 1/12/05.
- Framing of Issues Disposition of Canyon Facilities Prepared by EnviroIssues For Hanford Advisory Board, EnviroIssues, 7/11/1997.

- Central Plateau Remediation Planning, Larry Romine and Margo Voogd, 1/12/2005.
- Central Plateau Remediation/Closure Planning Principles (Discussion Draft), 10/17/2003.
- Big Picture Questions on Caps / Barriers, Rob Davis, 1/12/2005.
- Overview of Surface Barriers For Waste Containment, Kevin Leary, 1/12/2005.
- 2004-2005 Meetings and Public Comment Periods Timeline, 1/11/2005.
- River and Plateau Committee Work Planning Table, 1/12/2005.
- Draft Board Values / “Decision Tree,” Hanford Advisory Board, 11/2004.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Mike Priddy	Gary Peterson
Harold Heacock	Dick Smith	Maynard Plahuta
Pam Larsen	Tom Stoops	Todd Martin
Susan Leckband	Steve White	
Nancy Murray (phone)	John Stanfill	
Vince Panesko	Rob Davis	

Others

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Janet Badden, CHG
Kevin Leary, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Brad Smith, CHG
Frank Roddy, DOE-RL	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Larry Romine, DOE-RL		Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
Joe Voice, DOE-RL	Craig Cameron, EPA	Theresa Bergman, FH
		Mark Gibson, FH
		Julie Robertson, FH
		Barbara Wise, FH
		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec/ORP
		Barbara Harper, CTUIR